<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12 and 20 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Kim in the January 22, 2009 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claim 1 was objected to for informalities. As agreed during the personal interview, claim 1 has been amended responsive to the objection. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-9, 11 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 was rejected because it is allegedly unclear as to whether the recited language of informs, provides and prompts is describing the outputting of a communication or describing the functions of the output device. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 as previously submitted was clear; however, in order to advance prosecution, claim 1 has been amended such that the objected language is included in the method steps. As agreed during the personal interview, the amended claims clearly recite which devices perform the steps of the method because each step refers to either the controller or the output device performing the step.

Claims 2-9 and 11 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Claim 20 was rejected as allegedly being unclear as to whether the controller or the output device determines, informs, provides and prompts. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 20 as previously submitted was clear; however, in order to advance prosecution,

claim 20 has been amended such that it more clearly recites that the controller determines, informs, provides and prompts. As agreed during the personal interview, claim 20 now clearly recites which actions are performed by the controller and the output device because the claim clearly indicates that the controller determines, informs, prompts, receives and omits.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential steps. The Office Action alleges that the omitted step is the providing step in claim 1. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for providing a set of instructions, via an output device...when the responsible party wants to receive the set of instructions and omitting the set of instructions when the responsible party does not want to receive the set of instructions. As agreed during the personal interview, the providing step is clearly called for in claim 1 and therefore is not omitted.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-9 and 10-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Drummond et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0096994. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for providing a set of instructions, via an output device . . . when the responsible party wants to receive the set of instructions and omitting the set of instructions when the responsible party does not want to receive the set of instructions. Claim 12 calls for a machine-readable storage medium and claim 20 calls for a system, both with similar features. Applicants respectfully assert that Drummond fails to teach or suggest these features.

The Office Action, on page 7, alleges that Drummond teaches a step of providing instructions at paragraphs [0148] - [0153]. The Office Action further alleges that Drummond discloses a prompting step in paragraphs [0097], [0116], [0145] and [0153].

Applicants respectfully assert that the above referenced paragraphs of Drummond cannot reasonably be interpreted as teaching or suggesting omitting the set of instructions. Drummond does teach that the messages may be sent to different locations (see, for example, paragraph [0149]); however, there is no teaching or suggestion that the messages are ever omitted. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art could not reasonably interpret Drummond as teaching or suggesting omitting the set of instructions when the responsible party does not want to receive the set of instructions.

The Office Action also alleges that instructions are non-functional descriptive material that does not limit the step of prompting a user. Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that the instructions are functional descriptive language. Claim 1 calls for a method of providing a set of instructions and omitting the set of instructions. Claim 12 calls for a machine readable storage medium causing a processor to provide a set of instructions and to omit the set of instructions. Claim 20 calls for a controller that provides a set of instructions and omits the set of instructions. There is nothing in the specification or claims to suggest that the instructions are non-functional descriptive material that does not limit the claims.

Claims 2-9, 11 and 13-19 are patentable by reason of their dependency from one of independent claims 1 and 12, as well as for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks

Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/mkg

Date: February 20, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 320850 Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461